1	DINA L. SANTOS, SBN 204200			
2	Dina L. Santos, A Professional Law Corp. 455 Capitol Mall, Suite 802			
	Sacramento, California 95814			
3	Telephone: (916) 447-0160			
4	Attaurant fau			
5	Attorney for RICARDO MARMALEJO			
6				
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
8				
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No.: 21 CR-020 JAM			
10	Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE STATUS CONFERENCE			
11) CONTINUE STITTOS CONTENENCE			
12	vs. NEHEMIAH AVILA, CEASAR) Date: February 13, 2024 Time: 9:00 a.m.			
13	MARTINEZ, RICARDO MARJALEJO Judge: Hon. Mendez			
14	Defendants.			
15				
16				
	<u>STIPULATION</u>			
17	The United States of America through its undersigned counsel, Adrian Kinsella,			
18	Assistant United States Attorney, together with Attorney Todd Leras on behalf of			
19	Nehemia Avila; Attorney Michael Long on behalf of Ceasar Martinez, and Attorney Dina			
20	Santos, on behalf of Ricardo Marmalejo, hereby stipulate the following:			
21	1. The Status Conference was previously set for January 9, 2024. By this stipulation,			
22	the parties now move to continue the Status Conference to February 13, 2024, at			
23	9:00 a.m. and to exclude time between January 9, 2024, and February 13, 2024,			
24	under the Local Code T-4 (to allow defense counsel time to prepare).			
25	2. The parties agree and stipulate, and request the Court find the following:			
26				
27	a. A continuance is requested to continue to allow the Defense to continue to			
28	review the voluminous discovery, conduct investigation, confer with client's			
- 0	1			

and discuss a potential resolution. All Counsel require additional time to prepare.

- b. Counsel for the Defendants believes the failure to grant a continuance in this case would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
- c. The Government does not object to the continuance.
- d. Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.
- e. For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 United States Code Section 3161(h)(7)(A) within which trial must commence, the time period of January 9, 2024, to February 13, 2024, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 United States Code Section 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv), corresponding to Local Code T-4 because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.
- 3. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

DATED: December 27, 2023

27

28

Phillip Talbert United States Attorney

/s/ Adrian Kinesella ADRIAN KINSELLA Assistant U.S. Attorney

Case 2:21-cr-00020-JAM Document 96 Filed 12/29/23 Page 3 of 3

1	DATED:	December 27, 2023	/a/ Tadd Laws	
2			/s/ Todd Leras TODD LERAS Attorney for Nehemiah Avila	
3	DATED:	December 27, 2023	Audiney for Nehemian Avna	
4	DiffED.	Beccinical 27, 2023	/s/ Michael Long MICHAEL LONG	
5			Attorney for Ceasar Martinez	
6				
7	DATED:	December 27, 2023	/s/ Dina Santos	
8			DINA SANTOS Attorney for Ricardo Marmalejo	
9			·	
10	<u>ORDER</u>			
11	The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding Excludable Time			
12	Period Pursuant to Speedy Trial Act, filed by the parties in this matter. The Court hereby			
13	finds that the Stipulation, which this Court incorporates by reference into this Order,			
14	demonstrates facts that provide good cause for a finding of excludable time pursuant to			
15 16	the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.			
17	The Court further finds that: (i) the ends of justice served by the continuance			
18	outweigh the best interest of the public and defendant in a speedy trial; and (ii) failure to			
19	grant the continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the Speedy			
20				
21				
22	Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excluded from the period within which			
23	trial must commence.			
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
25	Dated: Dece	ember 28, 2023	/s/ John A. Mendez	
26	Daicd. Dece	Sinuci 20, 2023	THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ	
27			SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	

28